

**Draft Summary of the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group Meeting
Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)
February 22, 2001**

The Department of Water Resources (DWR) hosted the Recreation/Socioeconomics Work Group meeting on February 22, 2001 in Oroville.

A summary of the discussion, decisions made, and action items is provided below. This summary is not intended to be a transcript, analysis of the meeting, or to indicate agreement or disagreement with any of the items summarized, except where expressly stated. The intent is to present a summary of the discussion for information purposes for interested parties who could not attend the meeting.

Introduction

Attendees were welcomed to the Work Group meeting. The meeting objectives were discussed. The Work Group Meeting agenda and list of meeting attendees and their affiliations are appended to this summary as Attachments 1 and 2, respectively. Notes recorded on flip charts during the meeting are included as Attachment 3.

Educational Presentation – Life Cycle of Salmonids

Craig Fleming of the US Fish and Wildlife Service gave a presentation on the life cycle of salmonids (fish that are born in fresh water, move to salt water for some portion of their development, and then return to freshwater to reproduce). Craig correlated the timing of salmonids rearing, development, migration and spawning cycles to the water flow and temperature of major rivers in the Sacramento Valley. Many salmonids (notably Chinook salmon and steelhead trout) prefer colder water (between 48 and 58 degrees) for spawning, and rearing, which can only be found in the high elevation headwaters of most Sierra Nevada Rivers. With the building of large dams on most of the tributaries of the Sacramento River, much of this habitat has been lost. As a result river managers are forced to provide cold water for fish habitat to the accessible portions of the river.

- The group questioned the differences between hatchery and wild fish, and asked if hatchery fish could be substituted for wild fish. Craig responded that the hatcheries' main purpose is to mitigate the original construction of the dam. He added that the goal of fisheries biologists is to provide for wild fish populations that are self-perpetuating and there is concern among biologists regarding the genetic health of wild fish as opposed to their hatchery counterparts. He added that it is difficult to distinguish a wild fish from a hatchery fish visually but the wild strains are important for their contribution to gene pool size. Improvements to hatchery practices are improving the genetic diversity of hatchery-produced fish and it is important to continue to develop an understanding of the fish habitat requirements and how they interrelate with human uses of the river system.
- One participant asked if fish habitat in the "low flow area" could be improved if releases into the river were increased from 600 cfs. Craig responded that increasing flow to about 1200 cfs would improve, and potentially increase, the amount of habitat in that area.
- All handouts distributed to the Work Group as part of this presentation are appended to this summary as Attachment 4.

Action Items – December 7, 2000 Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group Meeting

The facilitator distributed hard copies of the summary notes for the January 25, 2001 Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group meeting since they were not available to participants before the meeting, and informed the group that the summary had been posted to the web site.

The facilitator reviewed the status of action items from the previous Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group meeting.

- Action Item #1:** Task Force to identify interim projects (enhancements) & develop criteria and protocol for moving some projects forward during the relicensing process and report back to the Work Group.
- Status: The Task Force was established and met twice since the January 25th meeting. A report on Task Force activities is included in this meeting.
- Action Item #2:** Provide State Parks & Recreation 1973 Oroville General Plan and Amendment to document repository.
- Status: Document has been ordered from State Parks.
- Action Item #3:** Develop White Paper regarding Endangered Species Act and the relicensing process.
- Status: US Fish and Wildlife is in the process of developing the White Paper.
- Action Item #4:** Presentation to Work Group regarding the life history of salmonids.
- Status: FWS representative will be making presentation at today's meeting.
- Action Item #5:** Presentation by local agencies outlining guidelines, policies or directions related to this process.
- Status: Representatives from the JPA & Feather River Parks & Recreation District at today's meeting.
- Action Item #6:** Presentation by the State Water Contractors regarding their relationship to the SWP.
- Status: Presentation by SWC representative at today's meeting.
- Action Item #7:** Work Group members to review IIP, study issues development by the Work Group, and group issues into scoping statements.
- Status: Scoping statements will be reviewed in today's meeting.

Roles and Responsibilities in FERC Relicensing

Joint Powers Authority

Gordon Andoe, the Mayor of Oroville and the Chair of the Lake Oroville Joint Powers Authority (JPA), made a presentation to the Work Group regarding the role of the JPA in the relicensing process. The JPA is made up of representatives from the City of Oroville, Butte County, the Feather River Parks and Recreation Department, the City of Gridley, and the Town of Paradise. The purpose of the JPA is to receive input from the public, and make sure that it is communicated to the relicensing process. Mr. Andoe stressed that the JPA would not be developing a separate recreation plan, but would be working as part of the collaborative process within the guidelines of the ALP. He added that the JPA has access to technical assistance that would help them give their ideas form so that they can be more effectively added to the relicensing effort. Mayor Andoe mentioned that Pete Dangermond, of The Dangermond Group, has been hired to assist the JPA in this effort.

Ward Tabor with DWR described the agreement recently signed by the JPA and DWR and mentioned that the JPA will receive \$75,000 in annual funding from DWR. He agreed that the JPA has a short-term role in assisting in the ALP. He added that the JPA could have a long-term goal in helping to enforce the provisions of the recreation agreements made during relicensing.

Pete Dangermond introduced the JPA's framework for developing a recreation plan through the collaborative process. He indicated that the JPA would provide input on planning methods, areas of focus and opportunity, including suggestions to the Work Group regarding important studies. He provided the group with a handout which is appended to this summary as Attachment 5.

The Work Group agreed that Mr. Dangermond should come to their next meeting and give a more detailed report regarding the JPA's recreation framework.

- One participant wanted to know why the groups were developing new recreation plans when earlier plans had not been fully implemented. Dale Hoffman-Floerke of DWR responded that it was important for the Work Group to see relicensing as an opportunity to broaden the scope of

recreation considered for study. She mentioned that people currently pursue recreational activities that did not exist when the dam was built. She cautioned the Work Group that if they concentrate on previous plans they could miss developing new popular recreational opportunities.

Feather River Parks and Recreation District

Scott Lawrence of the Feather River Parks and Recreation District, and Charlie Miller of the City of Oroville, provided the Work Group with an overview of their agencies operations, and their role in the relicensing process. Both stressed that they did not have regulatory authority and would be active in an advisory role in the collaborative process. They described their service areas and the types of programs and activities they provided. They mentioned that they wanted a comprehensive plan that adds to the quality of life of residents, addresses the range of recreation interests in the area, and develops facilities that will help draw more recreational users to the area. Scott Lawrence mentioned that development of the West Park River Bend project was of particular interest to the public and might be applicable to the relicensing process. Handout provided is appended to this summary as Attachment 6.

State Water Contractors

Craig Jones described the role of the State Water Contractors (SWC), their relationship to the State Water Project (SWP), and their role in the relicensing process. The SWC is an organization that represents 27 public agencies throughout California that have long-term contracts for water supply from the SWP. Under the terms of their agreements, the SWC are responsible for repaying, with interest, the costs for developing and delivering that water supply. Water development and delivery represents over 90% of the SWP overall costs.

The goal of the SWC in the relicensing process is to actively participate in the relicensing of the Oroville Hydroelectric Project in a manner that protects the interests of the SWC by maximizing water supply and power generation while maintaining the flexibility of the system and reliability.

Craig stressed that the supplies received from the SWP vary with the amount of water available during the year. In dry years contractors must find alternate sources of water. In wet years, many contractors take their allotment, and store surplus waters, thus freeing up reservoir space in the SWP. Regardless of the deliveries made, SWC are liable for the annual fixed costs of the system. He cautioned that with increasing demand for water in the state, the SWC would probably be taking more of their full allocation from the SWP in the future. He noted that the per-unit cost of delivered water could range from \$65 to nearly \$770 per acre-foot depending on where the water is delivered. Typically the further the water travels the higher the cost. Handout provided is appended to this summary as Attachment 7.

- One participant asked if the SWC have conservation standards in place. Patricia Watters, Metropolitan Water District responded that as one of the contractors represented by SWC, they have a very active conservation program.
- One participant asked about Diamond Valley Lake and the transfer of water from Lake Oroville to Southern California to fill this reservoir. Craig responded that the water taken to fill Diamond Valley was within the allocation for the contractor in question and added that Diamond Valley is an example of a contractor “banking water” for future use under emergency or drought situations.

Interim Projects Task Force Report

Dale Hoffman-Floerke of DWR provided the Work Group with an update regarding the activities of the Interim Projects Task Force. Dale reported that the Task Force had met twice since their formation. In the first meeting, the Task Force reviewed a straw-person proposal regarding process and criteria for reviewing and determining whether a project should be considered for interim

implementation. The Task Force accepted these criteria and evaluated a sample project against them. Using an example project, “reconstruction of the flash dam on the lower river”, the Task Force applied the draft criteria and determined that that particular project would not be considered as an interim project.

In the second meeting the Task Force looked at all the issues brought up during the Work Group and other public meetings, and identified those that could potentially qualify as interim projects. She mentioned that approximately 75 of the projects fell into the interim category. Dale added that this list of projects would receive further evaluation by the Task Force, and would be forwarded to the Work Group and then on to the Plenary Group for their consideration. Projects that were deemed to be appropriate interim projects by the Plenary Group would then move on toward identification of funding for implementation.

Dale suggested that if Work Group members had additional information regarding these projects, it should be forwarded to the Task Force.

- One participant asked if the Criteria adopted by the Task Force could be distributed to the Work Group. Dale agreed to put the criteria on the web site and place them in the information repository.
- The next Task Force meeting is March 2nd at the DWR Field Division, and is open to the public.

Development of Scoping Statements

- The Work Group is tasked with developing a series of issue statements for inclusion in the Scoping Document. The Scoping Document, required by FERC and NEPA, identifies issues associated with the relicensing of the Oroville Facilities and guides the development of studies necessary to address each issue.

The facilitator and Steve Nachtman of the Consulting Team, lead the Work Group in a discussion of these concepts, and helped the group develop an understanding of their responsibilities regarding developing issue statements for the Scoping Document. The Work Group was provided with two versions of a sample issue statement focusing on recreational facilities. Steve then gave the Work Group an example of a detailed Preliminary Issue Sheet focusing on the same subject. Once issues are crafted for inclusion in the Scoping Document, the group will expand each issue with an Issue Sheet that will include identification of goals, objectives, information available and additional study needs relative to that issue. The Draft Issue Statement Development handout and the Preliminary Issue Sheet are appended to this summary as Attachments 8 and 9, respectively.

The group discussed the development of issue statements and recognized that the issue statements would drive the studies conducted and therefore had to accurately reflect the Work Group’s desires. The group agreed to let Steve Nachtman and the process consultant team prepare draft issue statements for review and comment at the next Work Group meeting.

Next Meeting

The Work Group discussed their short-term meeting schedule as it relates to the Scoping Document. The facilitator mentioned that the scoping document was due to be released on May 15, 2001. The Work Group could meet twice before then to develop and finalize issue statements to be include in the document.

The Work Group agreed to meet on:

Date: Thursday, March 22, 2001
Time: 6:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m.

Location: Eagles Hall
And
Date: Thursday, April 19, 2001
Time: 6:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m.
Location: To be announced

The Work Group was reminded of the following meetings:
Environmental Work Group – February 27, 2001
Plenary Group – February 28, 2001
Engineering and Operations Work Group -- March 1, 2001
Land Use and Aesthetics Work Group -- March 13, 2001

Detailed information regarding these meetings is available on the relicensing web site. The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group meeting was adjourned at 10 p.m..

Agreements Made

1. The Work Group agreed to review draft issues statements developed by the consulting team at their next meeting.
2. The Work Group agreed to meet again on March 22, 2001 from 6:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. at the Eagles Hall and on April 19, 2001 from 6:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. (location to be announced).

Action Items

The following list of action items identified by the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group includes a description of the action, the participant responsible for the action, and item status.

Action Item #1: Pete Dangermond will provide the Work Group an overview of the Recreation Master Plan Framework developed by the JPA
Responsible: JPA
Due Date: March 22, 2001

Action Item #2: Develop White Paper regarding Endangered Species Act and the relicensing process.
Responsible: USFWS
Due Date: March 22, 2001

Action Item #3: Provide Work Group with Interim Project Task Force project screening criteria.
Responsible: DWR Staff
Due Date: March 22, 2001

Action Item #4: Develop draft issue statements for Work Group review and comment.
Responsible: Consulting Team
Due Date: March 22, 2001

**Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group Meeting Agenda
Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)
February 22, 2001**

Agenda

Desired Outcomes

- *Education Presentation - Salmonids*
- *Update on Action Items*
- *Continued Understanding of Roles and Responsibilities*
- *Update from Task Force on Interim Projects*
- *Further Development of Issues into Scoping Statements*

- 1. Welcome, Opening Remarks, Update, Introductions**
- 2. Educational Presentation – Salmonids**
- 3. January 25, 2001 Meeting Summary and Action Items**
- 4. Roles and Responsibilities in FERC Relicensing**
 - Joint Power Authority
 - Feather River Parks and Recreation District
 - State Water Contractors
- 5. Interim Projects Task Force Update**
- 6. Development of Scoping Statements (homework)**
- 7. Action Items and Next Steps**

**Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group Meeting Attendees
Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)**

Adrian Smith	Resident
Andy Atkinson	California Department of Fish & Game / Oroville Wildlife Management
Annette DeBrotherton	California Autochthon Peoples Foundation
Bill Rogers	Oro Water Ski Club
Bill Wilson	Citizens for Fair Government
Bob Sharkey	Feather River Recreation & Parks District
Brad Corkin	Oro Water Ski Club
Cathy Hodges	Equestrian Trail Riders / Hiker
Charles L. Miller	City of Oroville Department of Parks & Trees
Craig Fleming	US Fish & Wildlife Service, Anadromous Fish Restoration Program
Craig T. Jones	State Water Contractors
D.C. Jones	Resident
Dale Hoffman-Floerke	Department of Water Resources, Environmental Compliance & Evaluation Branch
Dave Ferguson	Department of Water Resources
David Whitewolf	Cherokee Tribal Council/NANRC111
Dean Lantrip	Resident
Dick Dunkel	Lake Oroville Fish Enhancement Committee
Doug Rischbieter	Department of Water Resources, Northern District
Douglas Poppelreiter	Lake Oroville Fish Enhancement Committee
Eva Begley	Department of Water Resources, Operations & Maintenance
Floyd Higgins	Oroville Model Airplane Club
Frances Kelley	Butter County Citizens for Fair Government
Gordon Andoe	City of Oroville
Harry Williamson	National Park Service
James DiGiorgio	Department of Boating and Waterways
Jim Upholt	Department of Water Resources
Jim Williamson	Oroville Air Corps
John Lance	Department of Water Resources
John Peconom	Kleinschmidt
Leah Wills	Plumas Corporation
Lonnie Steedman	Oroville Chamber of Commerce
Lorraine Frazier	Mooretown Rancheria
M.D. Short	Experimental Aircraft Association
Mark Hennelly	California Waterfowl Association
Mary Vincent	Supervisor Bob Beeler
Michael Pierce	ORAC – Butte County Alternate
Mike Hurst	LOBO
Mike Kelley	Butte County Tax Payers Association
Mike Vroomn	Resident on Feather River
Patricia Watters	Metropolitan Water District
Pete Soderberg	The Dangermond Group
Peter Maki	Feather River Nature Center
Ray Gannett	Funtime Fulltime Inc., dba Bidwell Marina
Ron Davis	Oroville Pageant Riders
Ron Turner	Oroville Foundation of Flight
Scott Lawrence	Feather River Recreation and Parks Department
Shelly Byrne	Department of Water Resources
Sonny Brandt	Feather River Recreation District / Joint Powers Authority
Steve Nachtman	Harza/EDAW
Terry Erlewine	State Water Contractors
Wade Hough	Butte Sailing Club, ORAC
Ward Tabor	Department of Water Resources

Notes from Flip Charts Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)

The following list was recorded on flip charts during the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group Meeting. The flip chart listing is not intended to be a transcript or analysis of the meeting or to indicate agreement or disagreement with the items listed; the intent is to provide a summary for informational purposes for interested parties who could not attend the meeting.

Action Items

- Presentation by Dangermond Group on planning framework

Scoping Document Issues

- Socioeconomic impacts of project
- Lack of resource inventory and evaluation of how they can best be utilized
- Consider nexus to project
- Access/roadway development
- User friendly facilities and process for public/private partnering
- Funding sources – cost sharing – sustainability
- Continue public involvement through life of license
- Assess user demand and preferences
- Public safety
- Special events
- Sustainability (O+M built in)
- Synchronized planning with appropriate agencies
- Operations effects on recreation opportunities
- Fisheries management plan for project facilities (overlap with Environmental Work Group)
- Environmental regulatory constraints
- Wet year/dry year criteria impact on potential use and development

FWS Contact Information

Craig_Fleming@fws.gov